IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the Patent Application of	Group Art Unit: 2622
Wiatt Kettle	
Application No. 10/765,595	Examiner: LEE, Michael
Filed: January 26, 2004	
For: Fitting Video Feed to a Display Device	Confirmation No.: 1493

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is an Appeal Brief under Rule 41.37 appealing the decision of the Primary

Examiner dated July 1, 2010 (the "final Office Action"). Each of the topics required by Rule

41.37 is presented herewith and is labeled appropriately.

I. Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is Hewlett-Packard Development Company, LP, a limited partnership established under the laws of the State of Texas and having a principal place of business at 11445 Compaq Center Dr. W., Houston, TX 77070, U.S.A. (hereinafter "HPDC"). HPDC is a Texas limited partnership and is a wholly-owned affiliate of Hewlett-Packard Company, a Delaware Corporation, headquartered in Palo Alto, CA. The general or managing partner of HPDC is HPQ Holdings, LLC.

II. Related Appeals and Interferences

There are no appeals or interferences related to the present application of which the

Appellant is aware.

III. Status of Claims

Claims 1-31 are pending in the application and stand finally rejected. Accordingly,

Appellant appeals from the final rejection of claims 1-31, which claims are presented in the

Appendix.

IV. Status of Amendments

No amendments have been filed subsequent to the final Office Action of July 1, 2010, from which Appellant takes this appeal.

V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

A summary is given below of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims on appeal and the subject matter defined in any claim on appeal reciting a "means plus function" clause in accordance with the requirements of 35 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v). The citation to passages in the specification and drawings for each claim element does not imply that the limitations from the cited passages in the specification and drawings should be read into the corresponding claim elements. *See Superguide Corp. v. DirecTV Enterprises, Inc.*, 358 F.3d 870, 875, 69 USPQ2d 1865, 1868 (Fed. Cir. 2004); M.P.E.P. § 2111.01(II).

By way of background and without limitation of the claims, in one embodiment, at least one marker 8 is added 28 to video feed 4. Markers 8 may be added by any method. In one example, marker locations are manually selected and markers 8 are inserted with coordinates at the desired locations. (*Appellant's specification, para. [0031]*). Markers 8 define region 10 of frame 6. Region 10 has a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of display device 2. (*Appellant's specification, para. [0032]*). Video feed 4 is transmitted 30 to display device 2. At least one marker 8 is ascertained 32, defining region 10 of frame 6. Region 10 has a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution HR to vertical resolution VR ratio of display area 20 of display device 2. (*Appellant's specification, para. [0033]*).

At least one row of region 10, defined by the markers 8, is buffered 36. In one embodiment, buffering 36 of a row within the region 10 starts at marker 8 and terminates at the column defined by the formula: (vertical resolution VR of display device) * 4/3 + marker 8. (*Appellant's specification, para. [0036]*). If the vertical resolution of display device 2 matches 38 that of the incoming data stream, frame 6, after a sufficient number rows for frame 6 have arrived they may be displayed 40 without further manipulation. Otherwise, the

buffer data is routed through image processor 22 to scale 42 region 10 to scaled region 12, which matches the horizontal resolution HR to vertical resolution VR ratio of display device 2. Scaled region 12 is then displayed 40. (*Appellant's specification, para. [0037]*).

Turning now to the claims, Appellant's independent claims at issue in this appeal recite the following subject matter.

Claim 1:

A method for fitting a frame of a video feed (4) to a display device (2), the method comprising:

ascertaining at least one marker (32) defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution (HR) to vertical resolution (VR) ratio of the display device (2) (*Appellant's specification, para. [0033]*);

buffering at least one row of the region (36) defined by the at least one marker (8) and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker (8) such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker (8) are simultaneously cropped from the video feed (4) (*Appellant's specification, para. [0036]*); and

displaying, on the display device (2), the region of the frame (40) defined by the at least one marker (8) (*Appellant's specification, para. [0037]*).

Claim 9:

A method for transmitting a video feed (4) to a display device (2), the method comprising:

7

adding, to the video feed (4), at least one marker (8) (28) defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution (HR) to vertical resolution (VR) ratio of the display device (2) (*Appellant's specification, para. [0031]*);

transmitting (30) the video feed (4) to the display device (2) (*Appellant's specification, para. [0033]*);

parsing (32) the at least one marker (8) from the video feed (4) (*Appellant's specification, para. [0033]*);

buffering at least one row of the region (36) defined by the at least one marker (8) and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker (8) such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker (8) are simultaneously cropped from the video feed (4) (*Appellant's specification, para. [0036]*); and

displaying, on the display device (2), the region of the frame (40) defined by the at least one marker (8) (*Appellant's specification, para. [0037]*).

Claim 12:

A display device (2) for displaying a video feed (4), the display device (2) comprising:

a display area (20) having horizontal (HR) and vertical (VR) resolutions (*Appellant's specification, paras. [0021] and [0022]*);

a parser (14) configured to parse at least one marker (8) from the video feed (4), the at least one marker (8) defining a region of a frame of the video feed (4), the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution (HR) to vertical resolution (VR) ratio of the display area (20) (*Appellant's specification, paras. [0011], [0021] and [0025]*);

a buffer (16) configured to selectively store rows of the region defined by the at least one marker (8) and exclude rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker (8) such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker (8) are simultaneously cropped from the video feed (4) (*Appellant's specification, paras. [0011], [0021] and [0023]*); and

a video controller (18) configured to display, in the display area (20), the buffered rows (*Appellant's specification, paras. [0021] and [0024]*).

Claim 16:

A display device (2) for displaying a video feed (4), the display device (2) comprising:

a display area (20) having horizontal (HR) and vertical (VR) resolutions (*Appellant's specification, paras. [0021] and [0022]*);

means (14) for ascertaining at least one marker (8) defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution (HR) to vertical resolution (VR) ratio of the display device (2) (*Appellant's specification, paras. [0011], [0021] and [0025]*);

a buffer (16) (*Appellant's specification, paras. [0011], [0021] and [0023]*);

means (16) for storing in the buffer (16) at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker (8) and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker (8) such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker (8) are simultaneously cropped from the video feed (4) (*Appellant's specification, paras. [0036] and [0037]*); and

means (18) for displaying, on the display device (2), the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker (8) (*Appellant's specification, paras. [0021] and [0024]*).

Claim 24:

A program storage system (26) readable by a computer, tangibly embodying a program, applet, or instructions executable by the computer to perform method steps for fitting a frame of a video feed (4) to a display device (2), the method comprising:

ascertaining at least one marker (8) defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution (HR) to vertical resolution (VR) ratio of the display device (2) (*Appellant's specification, para. [0033]*);

buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker (8) and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker (8) such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker (8) are simultaneously cropped from the video feed (4) (*Appellant's specification, para. [0036]*); and

displaying, on the display device (2), the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker (8) (*Appellant's specification, para. [0037]*).

VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The final Office Action raised the following grounds of rejection.

(1)   Claims 1-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,141,693 to Perlman et al. (hereinafter Perlman).

Accordingly, Appellant hereby requests review of each of these grounds of rejection in the present appeal.

VII. Argument

The claims do not stand or fall together. Instead, Appellant presents separate

arguments for various independent and dependent claims. Each of these arguments is set

forth below with separate headings and subheadings as required by 37 C.F.R. §

41.37(c)(1)(vii).

(1)   Claims 1-31 are patentable over *Perlman*:

Claim 1:

Claim 1 recites:

A method for fitting a frame of a video feed to a display device, the method
comprising:
        ***ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the
region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal
resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device***;
        ***buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one
marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one
marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one
marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed***; and
        displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by
the at least one marker.
(Emphasis added).

In contrast, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "[a] method for fitting a frame of a

video feed to a display device, the method comprising ascertaining at least one marker

defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a

horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device, buffering at least one

row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region

defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least

one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed, and displaying, on the display

device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker." (Claim 1).

First, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "ascertaining *at least one marker defining a*

region of the frame . . . excluding rows *outside* the region defined by the at least one

marker." (Claim 1) (emphasis added). Perlman teaches a cropping function that "provides a

means for eliminating a portion of the video frame in order to make the video frame fit on a

particular display device." (Perlman, col. 11, ll. 56-58).

> The cropping function 1605 specifies a region of the video frame defined by
> a region start xy location and a region end xy location. Alternatively, *the*
> *crop function 1605 may specify two regions, one region on the left hand*
> *side and one region on the right hand side of the video frame or one*
> *region on top and one region on the bottom of a video frame*. In each case,
> *the region specified by the crop function 1605 65 is eliminated from the*
> *video frame* identified by frame number 1003.

(Perlman, col. 11, ll. 59-67) (emphasis added).

In other words, the "region start xy location" and "region end xy location" define

portions of a frame that are excluded themselves. On this point, the final Office Action

argues, "[i]n column 11, lines 56-58, Perlman states that the video data in a region that fits a

display device is kept while anything outside the region is cropped. As set forth above, *the x*

and y coordinates can be used to define this region." (final Office Action, p. 4). However,

it is clear that the "region start xy location" and "region end xy location" do not define a

region of a frame outside of which portions are excluded. Claim 1, in contrast, recites,

"ascertaining *at least one marker defining a region of the frame* . . . excluding rows *outside*

the region defined by the at least one marker." (Claim 1) (emphasis added). Thus, for at least

this reason, the rejection of claim 1 should not be sustained.

Second, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "ascertaining at least one marker defining

a region of the frame, *the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal*

resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device." (Claim 1) (emphasis added).

The final Office Action argues:

> In column 11, lines 56-66, Perlman clearly states that cropping function provides a means for eliminating a portion of the video frame in order to make the video frame to fit on a particular video display device. *Since the cropping function changes the dimensions and resolution of the input video frame both in horizontal direction and vertical direction*, it clearly meets the claimed invention.

(final Office Action, pp.3-4) (emphasis added).

However, the final Office Action reads too much into the teachings of Perlman. Perlman simply teaches, "[c]ropping function 1605 provides a means for eliminating a portion of the video frame *in order to make the video frame fit on a particular display device*." (Perlman, col. 11, ll. 56-58). However, Perlman is silent regarding matching any dimensions of a cropped frame with the resolution of a display device. In fact, Perlman is silent regarding *matching* any parameters of a cropped frame with any parameters of a display device. Further, Perlman clearly does not teach or suggest, "the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device." (Claim 1). For at least this additional reason, the rejection of claim 1 should not be sustained.

Third, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker." (Claim 1). The final Office Action argues, Perlman discloses . . . a client device 820 which inherently includes a video memory or buffer for buffering the processed video data (col. 8, lines 18-25)." (final Office Action, p. 2). However, this is incorrect.

Perlman teaches the following:

> As shown in FIG. 8, the client device 820 receives video data 801 and client specific auxiliary data 805. Using the client specific auxiliary data 805, client device 820 can modify the video data 801 to produce modified video

14

images which can then be displayed on display device 830. In this alternative embodiment, *client device 820 must have the processing capacity necessary for manipulating video images within given timing constraints*.

(Perlman, col. 8, ll. 18-25) (emphasis added).

Clearly, Perlman fails to teach any system or subsystem capable of buffering. In fact, based on the above cited portion of Perlman, the system of Perlman requires a "client device 820 [that] *must* have the processing capacity necessary for manipulating video images *within given timing constraints*." (Perlman, col. 8, ll. 23-25) (emphasis added). This indicates that the system of Perlman explicitly does not use a buffer, and, instead, suggests that Perlman teaches a system that requires a non-buffering process. Therefore, because Perlman fails to teach or suggest, "buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker" (Claim 1), the rejection of claim 1 should not be sustained for at least this additional reason.

Fourth, Perlman fails to teach or suggest, "excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are *simultaneously cropped* from the video feed." (Claim 1) (emphasis added). It is clear from Perlman that the outside portions defined by the "region start xy location" and "region end xy location" are not cropped simultaneously because Perlman explicitly teaches that individual regions are cropped, and makes no mention of simultaneously cropping all regions. (*See, e.g.*, Perlman, col. 11, ll. 54-67).

Respectfully, to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each and every element of the claim, and "the identical invention must be shown *in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim*." MPEP 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987) and *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added). Moreover, "[t]he prior art reference—in order to anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102—must not only disclose all elements of the claim

15

within the four corners of the document, but must also disclose those elements 'arranged as in

the claim.'" *NetMoneyIn v. Verisign*, (Fed. Cir. 2008) (quoting *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck &*

Co., 722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

In the present case, Perlman clearly does not disclose the claimed invention with each

and every claimed element in the same amount of detail or as arranged in the claim.

Consequently, because Perlman clearly fails to satisfy the requirements for anticipating claim

1, the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 9:

Claim 9 recites:

A method for transmitting a video feed to a display device, the method
comprising:
    ***adding, to the video feed, at least one marker defining a region of
the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a
horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device***;
    transmitting the video feed to the display device;
    parsing the at least one marker from the video feed;
    ***buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one
marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one
marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one
marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed***; and
    displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by
the at least one marker.
(Emphasis added).

In contrast, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "[a] method for transmitting a video

feed to a display device, the method comprising adding, to the video feed, at least one marker

defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a

horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device, transmitting the video

feed to the display device, parsing the at least one marker from the video feed, buffering at

least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the

region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed, and displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker. (Claim 9).

First, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "adding, to the video feed, *at least one marker defining a region of the frame* . . . and excluding rows *outside* the region defined by the at least one marker." (Claim 9) (emphasis added). As similarly argued above in connection with the patentability of independent claim 1, Perlman teaches a "region start xy location" and a "region end xy location" that define portions of a frame that are excluded themselves. (*See, e.g.*, Perlman, col. 11, ll. 59-67). On this point, the final Office Action argues, "[i]n column 11, lines 56-58, Perlman states that the video data in a region that fits a display device is kept while anything outside the region is cropped. As set forth above, *the x and y coordinates can be used to define this region*." (final Office Action, p. 4). However, it is clear that the "region start xy location" and "region end xy location" do not define a region of a frame outside of which portions are excluded. Claim 9, in contrast, recites, "adding, to the video feed, *at least one marker defining a region of the frame* . . . and excluding rows *outside* the region defined by the at least one marker." (Claim 9) (emphasis added). Thus, for at least this reason, the rejection of claim 9 should not be sustained.

Second, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "adding, to the video feed, at least one marker defining a region of the frame, *the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device*." (Claim 9) (emphasis added). The final Office Action argues:

> In column 11, lines 56-66, Perlman clearly states that cropping function provides a means for eliminating a portion of the video frame in order to make the video frame to fit on a particular video display device. *Since the cropping function changes the dimensions and resolution of the input*

video frame both in horizontal direction and vertical direction, it clearly
meets the claimed invention.

(final Office Action, pp.3-4) (emphasis added).

However, as similarly argued above in favor of the patentability of independent claim

1, Perlman is silent regarding matching any dimensions of a cropped frame with the

resolution of a display device. In fact, Perlman is silent regarding *matching* any parameters

of a cropped frame with any parameters of a display device. Further, Perlman clearly does

not teach or suggest, "the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal

resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device." (Claim 9). For at least this

additional reason, the rejection of claim 9 should not be sustained.

Third, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "buffering at least one row of the region

defined by the at least one marker." (Claim 9). Again, the final Office Action argues,

Perlman discloses . . . a client device 820 which inherently includes a video memory or buffer

for buffering the processed video data (col. 8, lines 18-25)." (final Office Action, p. 2).

However, Perlman clearly fails to teach any system or subsystem capable of buffering. In

fact, based on the above cited portion of Perlman, the system of Perlman requires a "client

device 820 [that] *must* have the processing capacity necessary for manipulating video images

within given timing constraints." (Perlman, col. 8, ll. 23-25) (emphasis added). This

indicates that the system of Perlman explicitly does not use a buffer, and, instead, suggests

that Perlman teaches a system that requires a non-buffering process. Therefore, because

Perlman fails to teach or suggest, "buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at

least one marker." (Claim 9), the rejection of claim 9 should not be sustained for at least this

additional reason.

Fourth, Perlman fails to teach or suggest, "excluding rows outside the region defined

by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one

marker are **simultaneously cropped** from the video feed." (Claim 9) (emphasis added). It is clear from Perlman that the outside portions defined by the "region start xy location" and "region end xy location" are not cropped simultaneously because Perlman explicitly teaches that individual regions are cropped, and makes no mention of simultaneously cropping all regions. (*See, e.g.*, Perlman, col. 11, ll. 54-67).

Again, to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each and every element of the claim, and "the identical invention must be shown *in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim*." MPEP 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987) and *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added). Moreover, "[t]he prior art reference—in order to anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102—must not only disclose all elements of the claim within the four corners of the document, but must also disclose those elements 'arranged as in the claim.'" *NetMoneyIn v. Verisign*, (Fed. Cir. 2008) (quoting *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

In the present case, Perlman clearly does not disclose the claimed invention with each and every claimed element in the same amount of detail or as arranged in the claim. Consequently, because Perlman clearly fails to satisfy the requirements for anticipating claim 9, the rejection of claim 9 and its dependent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 12:

Claim 12 recites:

A display device for displaying a video feed, the display device comprising:
     a display area having horizontal and vertical resolutions;
     a parser configured to parse at least one marker from the video feed,
the at least one marker defining a region of a frame of the video feed, the

> *region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal*
> *resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display area;*
> > *a buffer configured to selectively store rows of the region defined*
> *by the at least one marker and exclude rows outside the region defined by*
> *the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by*
> *the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed;*
> and
> > *a video controller configured to display, in the display area, the*
> *buffered rows.*

(Emphasis added).

In contrast, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "[a] display device for displaying a video feed, the display device comprising a display area having horizontal and vertical resolutions, a parser configured to parse at least one marker from the video feed, the at least one marker defining a region of a frame of the video feed, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display area, a buffer configured to selectively store rows of the region defined by the at least one marker and exclude rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed, and a video controller configured to display, in the display area, the buffered rows." (Claim 12).

First, Perlman does not teach or suggest, *"at least one marker defining a region of a frame . . .* and exclude rows *outside* the region defined by the at least one marker." (Claim 12) (emphasis added). As similarly argued above in connection with the patentability of independent claims 1 and 9, Perlman teaches a "region start xy location" and a "region end xy location" that define portions of a frame that are excluded themselves. (*See, e.g.*, Perlman, col. 11, ll. 59-67). On this point, the final Office Action argues, "[i]n column 11, lines 56-58, Perlman states that the video data in a region that fits a display device is kept while anything outside the region is cropped. As set forth above, *the x and y coordinates can be used to*

define this region." (final Office Action, p. 4). However, it is clear that the "region start xy

location" and "region end xy location" do not define a region of a frame outside of which

portions are excluded. Claim 12, in contrast, recites, "*at least one marker defining a region*

of a frame . . . and exclude rows *outside* the region defined by the at least one marker."

(Claim 12) (emphasis added). Thus, for at least this reason, the rejection of claim 12 should

not be sustained.

Second, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "a display area having horizontal and

vertical resolutions . . . *at least one marker defining a region of a frame of the video feed,*

the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical

resolution ratio of the display area." (Claim 12) (emphasis added). The final Office Action

argues:

> In column 11, lines 56-66, Perlman clearly states that cropping function
> provides a means for eliminating a portion of the video frame in order to
> make the video frame to fit on a particular video display device. *Since the*
> *cropping function changes the dimensions and resolution of the input*
> *video frame both in horizontal direction and vertical direction*, it clearly
> meets the claimed invention.

(final Office Action, pp.3-4) (emphasis added).

However, as similarly argued above in favor of the patentability of independent claims

1 and 9, Perlman is silent regarding matching any dimensions of a cropped frame with the

resolution of a display device. In fact, Perlman is silent regarding *matching* any parameters

of a cropped frame with any parameters of a display device. Further, Perlman clearly does

not teach or suggest, "the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal

resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display area." (Claim 12). For at least this

additional reason, the rejection of claim 12 should not be sustained.

Third, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "a buffer configured to selectively store

rows of the region defined by the at least one marker." (Claim 12). Again, the final Office

Action argues, Perlman discloses . . . a client device 820 which inherently includes a video memory or buffer for buffering the processed video data (col. 8, lines 18-25)." (final Office Action, p. 2). However, Perlman clearly fails to teach any system or subsystem capable of buffering. In fact, based on the above cited portion of Perlman, the system of Perlman requires a "client device 820 [that] *must* have the processing capacity necessary for manipulating video images *within given timing constraints*." (Perlman, col. 8, ll. 23-25) (emphasis added). This indicates that the system of Perlman explicitly does not use a buffer, and, instead, suggests that Perlman teaches a system that requires a non-buffering process. Therefore, because Perlman fails to teach or suggest, "a buffer configured to selectively store rows of the region defined by the at least one marker." (Claim 12), the rejection of claim 12 should not be sustained for at least this additional reason.

Fourth, Perlman fails to teach or suggest, "a buffer configured to selectively store rows of the region defined by the at least one marker and exclude rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are *simultaneously cropped* from the video feed." (Claim 12) (emphasis added). It is clear from Perlman that the outside portions defined by the "region start xy location" and "region end xy location" are not cropped simultaneously because Perlman explicitly teaches that individual regions are cropped, and makes no mention of simultaneously cropping all regions. (*See, e.g.*, Perlman, col. 11, ll. 54-67).

Again, to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each and every element of the claim, and "the identical invention must be shown *in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim*." MPEP 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987) and *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added). Moreover, "[t]he prior art reference—in

order to anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102—must not only disclose all elements of the claim

within the four corners of the document, but must also disclose those elements 'arranged as in

the claim.'" *NetMoneyIn v. Verisign*, (Fed. Cir. 2008) (quoting *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck &*

Co., 722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

In the present case, Perlman clearly does not disclose the claimed invention with each

and every claimed element in the same amount of detail or as arranged in the claim.

Consequently, because Perlman clearly fails to satisfy the requirements for anticipating claim

12, the rejection of claim 12 and its dependent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 16:

Claim 16 recites:

A display device for displaying a video feed, the display device comprising:
　　　　a display area having horizontal and vertical resolutions;
　　　　means for ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the
frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a
horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device;
　　　　a buffer;
　　　　means for storing in the buffer at least one row of the region
defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region
defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region
defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the
video feed; and
　　　　means for displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame
　　　defined by the at least one marker.
(Emphasis added).

In contrast, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "[a] display device for displaying a

video feed, the display device comprising a display area having horizontal and vertical

resolutions, means for ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the

region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical

resolution ratio of the display device, a buffer, means for storing in the buffer at least one row

of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined

by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one

marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed, and means for displaying, on the

display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker." (Claim 16).

First, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "*at least one marker defining a region of*

the frame . . . and excluding rows *outside* the region defined by the at least one marker."

(Claim 16) (emphasis added). As similarly argued above in connection with the patentability

of independent claims 1, 9, and 12, Perlman teaches a "region start xy location" and a "region

end xy location" that define portions of a frame that are excluded themselves. (*See, e.g.,*

Perlman, col. 11, ll. 59-67). On this point, the final Office Action argues, "[i]n column 11,

lines 56-58, Perlman states that the video data in a region that fits a display device is kept

while anything outside the region is cropped. As set forth above, *the x and y coordinates can*

be used to define this region." (final Office Action, p. 4). However, it is clear that the

"region start xy location" and "region end xy location" do not define a region of a frame

outside of which portions are excluded. Claim 16, in contrast, recites, "*at least one marker*

defining a region of the frame . . . and excluding rows *outside* the region defined by the at

least one marker." (Claim 16) (emphasis added). Thus, for at least this reason, the rejection

of claim 16 should not be sustained.

Second, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "a display area having horizontal and

vertical resolutions . . . *at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region*

having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution

ratio of the display device." (Claim 16) (emphasis added). The final Office Action argues:

> In column 11, lines 56-66, Perlman clearly states that cropping function
> provides a means for eliminating a portion of the video frame in order to
> make the video frame to fit on a particular video display device. *Since the*

cropping function changes the dimensions and resolution of the input
video frame both in horizontal direction and vertical direction, it clearly
meets the claimed invention.
(final Office Action, pp.3-4) (emphasis added).

However, as similarly argued above in favor of the patentability of independent claims

1, 9, and 12, Perlman is silent regarding matching any dimensions of a cropped frame with

the resolution of a display device. In fact, Perlman is silent regarding *matching* any

parameters of a cropped frame with any parameters of a display device. Further, Perlman

clearly does not teach or suggest, "the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a

horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device." (Claim 16). For at

least this additional reason, the rejection of claim 16 should not be sustained.

Third, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "a buffer, [and] means for storing in the

buffer at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows

outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region

defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed." (Claim

16). Again, the final Office Action argues, Perlman discloses . . . a client device 820 which

inherently includes a video memory or buffer for buffering the processed video data (col. 8,

lines 18-25)." (final Office Action, p. 2). However, Perlman clearly fails to teach any system

or subsystem capable of buffering. In fact, based on the above cited portion of Perlman, the

system of Perlman requires a "client device 820 [that] *must* have the processing capacity

necessary for manipulating video images *within given timing constraints*." (Perlman, col. 8,

ll. 23-25) (emphasis added). This indicates that the system of Perlman explicitly does not use

a buffer, and, instead, suggests that Perlman teaches a system that requires a non-buffering

process. Therefore, because Perlman fails to teach or suggest, "a buffer, [and] means for

storing in the buffer at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and

excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed." (Claim 16), the rejection of claim 16 should not be sustained for at least this additional reason.

Fourth, Perlman fails to teach or suggest, "a buffer, [and] means for storing in the buffer at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are **simultaneously cropped** from the video feed." (Claim 16) (emphasis added). It is clear from Perlman that the outside portions defined by the "region start xy location" and "region end xy location" are not cropped simultaneously because Perlman explicitly teaches that individual regions are cropped, and makes no mention of simultaneously cropping all regions. (*See, e.g.*, Perlman, col. 11, ll. 54-67).

Again, to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each and every element of the claim, and "the identical invention must be shown *in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim*." MPEP 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987) and *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added). Moreover, "[t]he prior art reference—in order to anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102—must not only disclose all elements of the claim within the four corners of the document, but must also disclose those elements 'arranged as in the claim.'" *NetMoneyIn v. Verisign*, (Fed. Cir. 2008) (quoting *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

In the present case, Perlman clearly does not disclose the claimed invention with each and every claimed element in the same amount of detail or as arranged in the claim.

Consequently, because Perlman clearly fails to satisfy the requirements for anticipating claim

16, the rejection of claim 16 and its dependent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 24:

Claim 24 recites:

A program storage system readable by a computer, tangibly embodying a
program, applet, or instructions executable by the computer to perform
method steps for fitting a frame of a video feed to a display device, the
method comprising:
*ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame,
the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal
resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device*;
*buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one
marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one
marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one
marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed*; and
displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by
the at least one marker.
(Emphasis added).

In contrast, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "[a] program storage system readable

by a computer, tangibly embodying a program, applet, or instructions executable by the

computer to perform method steps for fitting a frame of a video feed to a display device, the

method comprising ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region

having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution

ratio of the display device, buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one

marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the

rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from

the video feed, and displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at

least one marker." (Claim 24).

27

First, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "ascertaining *at least one marker defining a region of the frame* . . . and excluding rows *outside* the region defined by the at least one marker." (Claim 24) (emphasis added). As similarly argued above in connection with the patentability of independent claims 1, 9, 12, and 16, Perlman teaches a "region start xy location" and a "region end xy location" that define portions of a frame that are excluded themselves. (*See, e.g.*, Perlman, col. 11, ll. 59-67). On this point, the final Office Action argues, "[i]n column 11, lines 56-58, Perlman states that the video data in a region that fits a display device is kept while anything outside the region is cropped. As set forth above, *the x and y coordinates can be used to define this region*." (final Office Action, p. 4). However, it is clear that the "region start xy location" and "region end xy location" do not define a region of a frame outside of which portions are excluded. Claim 24, in contrast, recites, "ascertaining *at least one marker defining a region of the frame* . . . and excluding rows *outside* the region defined by the at least one marker." (Claim 24) (emphasis added). Thus, for at least this reason, the rejection of claim 24 should not be sustained.

Second, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, *the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device*." (Claim 24) (emphasis added). The final Office Action argues:

> In column 11, lines 56-66, Perlman clearly states that cropping function provides a means for eliminating a portion of the video frame in order to make the video frame to fit on a particular video display device. *Since the cropping function changes the dimensions and resolution of the input video frame both in horizontal direction and vertical direction*, it clearly meets the claimed invention.

(final Office Action, pp.3-4) (emphasis added).

However, as similarly argued above in favor of the patentability of independent claims 1, 9, 12, and 16, Perlman is silent regarding matching any dimensions of a cropped frame

28

with the resolution of a display device. In fact, Perlman is silent regarding *matching* any

parameters of a cropped frame with any parameters of a display device. Further, Perlman

clearly does not teach or suggest, "the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a

horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device." (Claim 24). For at

least this additional reason, the rejection of claim 24 should not be sustained.

Third, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "buffering at least one row of the region

defined by the at least one marker." (Claim 24). Again, the final Office Action argues,

Perlman discloses . . . a client device 820 which inherently includes a video memory or buffer

for buffering the processed video data (col. 8, lines 18-25)." (final Office Action, p. 2).

However, Perlman clearly fails to teach any system or subsystem capable of buffering. In

fact, based on the above cited portion of Perlman, the system of Perlman requires a "client

device 820 [that] *must* have the processing capacity necessary for manipulating video images

within given timing constraints." (Perlman, col. 8, ll. 23-25) (emphasis added). This

indicates that the system of Perlman explicitly does not use a buffer, and, instead, suggests

that Perlman teaches a system that requires a non-buffering process. Therefore, because

Perlman fails to teach or suggest, "buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at

least one marker." (Claim 24), the rejection of claim 24 should not be sustained for at least

this additional reason.

Fourth, Perlman fails to teach or suggest, "excluding rows outside the region defined

by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one

marker are *simultaneously cropped* from the video feed." (Claim 24) (emphasis added). It is

clear from Perlman that the outside portions defined by the "region start xy location" and

"region end xy location" are not cropped simultaneously because Perlman explicitly teaches

that individual regions are cropped, and makes no mention of simultaneously cropping all regions. (*See, e.g.*, Perlman, col. 11, ll. 54-67).

Again, to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each and every element of the claim, and "the identical invention must be shown *in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim*." MPEP 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987) and *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added). Moreover, "[t]he prior art reference—in order to anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102—must not only disclose all elements of the claim within the four corners of the document, but must also disclose those elements 'arranged as in the claim.'" *NetMoneyIn v. Verisign*, (Fed. Cir. 2008) (quoting *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

In the present case, Perlman clearly does not disclose the claimed invention with each and every claimed element in the same amount of detail or as arranged in the claim. Consequently, because Perlman clearly fails to satisfy the requirements for anticipating claim 24, the rejection of claim 24 and its dependent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Additionally, various dependent claims of the application recite subject matter that is further patentable over the cited prior art. Specific, non-exclusive examples follow.

Claims 3, 18, and 26:

Claim 3 recites, "[t]he method of claim 2 wherein parsing out the at least one marker from the video feed includes parsing out the at least one marker from a header of the video feed." Claim 18 similarly recites, "[t]he display device of claim 17 wherein the means for parsing out the at least one marker from the video feed includes means for parsing out the at

least one marker from a header of the video feed." Claim 26 recites, "[t]he program storage system of claim 25 wherein parsing out the at least one marker from the video feed includes parsing out the at least one marker from a header of the video feed."

In contrast, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "parsing out the at least one marker from a header of the video feed." (Claims 3, 18, and 26). The final Office Action argues, "[r]egarding claim 3, since the data are formatted in packets, it **inherently includes headers which include auxiliary data**." However, this is incorrect. Perlman is silent regarding parsing anything from a header of any data. Further, Perlman is silent regarding parsing out a marker from a header of the video feed.

Appellant points out that "[t]o establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence 'must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill.' 'Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient.'" *In re Robertson*, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (citations omitted). "[T]he examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic *necessarily* flows from the teachings of the applied prior art." *Ex parte Levy*, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1464 (BPAI 1990) (emphasis in original); see also, MPEP § 2112 (quoting Levy).

Here, the Examiner has made an attenuated argument that because data are formatted in packets, the data packets inherently include headers which include auxiliary data. There is no evidence, however, that even if, *arguendo*, the data packets of Perlman include headers that the auxiliary data is included in the headers. For at least this reason, the rejection of claims 3, 18, and 26 should not be sustained.

Claims 4, 19, and 27:

Claim 4 recites: "[t]he method of claim 1 wherein ascertaining at least one marker includes *fixing the at least one marker for each video feed.*" (Emphasis added). Claim 19 similarly recites, "[t]he display device of claim 16 wherein the means for ascertaining at least one marker includes means for fixing the at least one marker for each video feed." Further, claim 27 similarly recites, "[t]he program storage system of claim 24 wherein ascertaining at least one marker includes fixing the at least one marker for each video feed." In contrast, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "fixing the at least one marker for each video feed." (Claims 4, 19, and 27).

The final Office Action argues, "[i]n col. 9, lines 51-60, Perlman discloses how the auxiliary data is encoded into the video stream. (final Office Action, p. 4). However, nowhere does Perlman teach or suggest fixing a marker to *each* video feed. In fact, Perlman, in column 10, lines 3-7 teaches, "[t]he person analyzing the video stream may make this determination. Using the information encoding format illustrated in FIG. 10, *a plurality of frame numbers* and corresponding function information may be specified within auxiliary data 1001." (Emphasis added). Clearly, the auxiliary data of Perlman is not attributed to each frame.

Again, to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each and every element of the claim, and "the identical invention must be shown *in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim.*" MPEP 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987) and *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added). Moreover, "[t]he prior art reference—in order to anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102—must not only disclose all elements of the claim within the four corners of the document, but must also disclose those elements 'arranged as in

the claim.'" *NetMoneyIn v. Verisign*, (Fed. Cir. 2008) (quoting *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck &*

Co., 722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

In the present case, Perlman clearly does not disclose the claimed invention with each

and every claimed element in the same amount of detail or as arranged in the claim.

Consequently, because Perlman clearly fails to satisfy the requirements for anticipating claims

4, 19, and 27, the rejection of claims 4, 19, and 27 should not be sustained.

Claims 5, 13, 20, and 28:

Claim 5 recites "[t]he method of claim 1 wherein ascertaining at least one marker

includes ascertaining a single marker defining a first corner of the region and calculating from

the single marker and the horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio a second corner

opposite the first corner of the region." Claims 13 similarly recites, "[t]he display device of

claim 12 wherein the at least one marker includes a single marker defining a first corner of

the region and further including a processing system configured to calculate from the single

marker and the horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio a second corner opposite the

first corner of the region." Similarly, claim 20 recites, "[t]he display device of claim 16

wherein the means for ascertaining at least one marker includes means for ascertaining a

single marker defining a first corner of the region and means for calculating from the single

marker and the horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio a second corner opposite the

first corner of the region." Further, claim 28 similarly recites, "[t]he program storage system

of claim 24 wherein ascertaining at least one marker includes ascertaining a single marker

defining a first corner of the region and calculating from the single marker and the horizontal

resolution to vertical resolution ratio a second corner opposite the first corner of the region."

In contrast, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "ascertaining a single marker defining a first corner of the region and calculating from the single marker and the horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio a second corner opposite the first corner of the region." (Claims 5, 13, 20, and 28). The final Office Action cites to column 11, lines 16-18 and 54-67 of Perlman. (final Office Action, pp. 2 and 5). However, column 11, lines 54-67 of Perlman teaches a cropping function that eliminates regions within the video frame. As similarly argued above in favor of the patentability of independent claims 1, 9, 12, 16, and 24, Perlman teaches the opposite of claims 5, 13, 20, and 28 by explicitly eliminating portions of the video frame *inside* the selected portion.

Further, column 11, lines 9-18 of Perlman simply teach the following:

> Auxiliary data 1301 also includes information identifying a function to be performed on the identified video frame. In this example, *a centering function* is to be performed. ***The centering function includes information identifying a point in the video image defined as the display center***. In the preferred embodiment, the center point can be defined using x and y coordinates of a Cartesian two-dimensional space on 15 the display device. In an alternative embodiment, the display center point can be defined relatively from a reference point defined at one of the corners of the display device.

(Emphasis added).

In other words, this portion of Perlman teaches a different embodiment of Perlman, and is unrelated to the cropping function discussed in Perlman at column 11, lines 54-67. Further, at best, this portion of Perlman simply teaches ascertaining the center of a point in a video image correlating to the center of a display. Perlman fails to teach or suggest ascertaining a single marker defining a first corner of the region and calculating from the single marker and the horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio a second corner opposite the first corner of the region.

Further, Perlman does not teach or suggest, "calculating from the single marker and the horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio a second corner opposite the first corner of the region." (Claims 5, 13, 20, and 28). As argued above, Perlman is silent as to both the dimensions and resolution ratio of the identified rectangular region or a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of a display device. Therefore, Perlman cannot teach or suggest calculating from the single marker and the horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio a second corner opposite the first corner of the region.

In contrast, claims 5, 13, 20, and 28 recite, "ascertaining a single marker defining a first corner of the region and calculating from the single marker and the horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio a second corner opposite the first corner of the region." This subject matter is clearly not taught or suggested by Perlman.

Again, to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each and every element of the claim, and "the identical invention must be shown *in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim*." MPEP 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987) and *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added). Moreover, "[t]he prior art reference—in order to anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102—must not only disclose all elements of the claim within the four corners of the document, but must also disclose those elements 'arranged as in the claim.'" *NetMoneyIn v. Verisign*, (Fed. Cir. 2008) (quoting *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

In the present case, Perlman clearly does not disclose the claimed invention with each and every claimed element in the same amount of detail or as arranged in the claim. Consequently, because Perlman clearly fails to satisfy the requirements for anticipating claims

5, 13, 20, and 28, the rejection of claims 5, 13, 20, and 28 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the final rejection of the pending claims is improper and should not be sustained. Therefore, a reversal of the Rejection of July 1, 2010 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: November 1, 2010   /Steven L. Nichols/
                                                 Steven L. Nichols
                                                 Registration No. 40,326

STEVEN L. NICHOLS
Director, Intellectual Property Practice Group
VANCOTT PC
36 SOUTH STATE STREET, SUITE 1900
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111
P 801.237.0251
M 801.414.0750
F 801.237.0853
E snichols@vancott.com

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1.   (previously presented)   A method for fitting a frame of a video feed to a display device, the method comprising:

ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device;

buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed; and

displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.

2.   (original)   The method of claim 1 wherein ascertaining at least one marker includes parsing out the at least one marker from the video feed.

3.   (original)   The method of claim 2 wherein parsing out the at least one marker from the video feed includes parsing out the at least one marker from a header of the video feed.

4.   (original)   The method of claim 1 wherein ascertaining at least one marker includes fixing the at least one marker for each video feed.

5.   (original)   The method of claim 1 wherein ascertaining at least one marker
includes ascertaining a single marker defining a first corner of the region and calculating from
the single marker and the horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio a second corner
opposite the first corner of the region.

6.   (original)   The method of claim 1 wherein ascertaining at least one marker
includes ascertaining two markers defining opposite corners of the region.

7.   (original)   The method of claim 1 further including, scaling the region to fit the
horizontal and vertical resolution of the display.

8.   (original)   The method of claim 1 wherein buffering at least one row of the region
includes buffering each row of the region.

9.   (previously presented)   A method for transmitting a video feed to a display
device, the method comprising:
        adding, to the video feed, at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the
region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical
resolution ratio of the display device;
        transmitting the video feed to the display device;
        parsing the at least one marker from the video feed;
        buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and
excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows

outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed; and

    displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.

10.   (original)   The method of claim 9 wherein adding at least one marker includes adding a single marker defining a first corner of the region.

11.   (original)   The method of claim 9 wherein adding at least one marker includes adding two markers defining opposite corners of the region.

12.   (previously presented)   A display device for displaying a video feed, the display device comprising:

    a display area having horizontal and vertical resolutions;

    a parser configured to parse at least one marker from the video feed, the at least one marker defining a region of a frame of the video feed, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display area;

    a buffer configured to selectively store rows of the region defined by the at least one marker and exclude rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed; and

    a video controller configured to display, in the display area, the buffered rows.

13.   (original)   The display device of claim 12 wherein the at least one marker

includes a single marker defining a first corner of the region and further including a

processing system configured to calculate from the single marker and the horizontal

resolution to vertical resolution ratio a second corner opposite the first corner of the region.

14.   (original)   The display device of claim 12 wherein the at least one marker

includes two markers defining opposite corners of the region.

15.   (original)   The display device of claim 12 further including an image processor

configured to scale the region to fit the horizontal and vertical resolution of the display.

16.   (previously presented)   A display device for displaying a video feed, the display

device comprising:

        a display area having horizontal and vertical resolutions;

        means for ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region

having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution

ratio of the display device;

        a buffer;

        means for storing in the buffer at least one row of the region defined by the at least

one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that

the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped

from the video feed; and

        means for displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at

least one marker.

17.   (original)   The display device of claim 16 wherein the means for ascertaining at least one marker includes means for parsing out the at least one marker from the video feed.

18.   (original)   The display device of claim 17 wherein the means for parsing out the at least one marker from the video feed includes means for parsing out the at least one marker from a header of the video feed.

19.   (original)   The display device of claim 16 wherein the means for ascertaining at least one marker includes means for fixing the at least one marker for each video feed.

20.   (original)   The display device of claim 16 wherein the means for ascertaining at least one marker includes means for ascertaining a single marker defining a first corner of the region and means for calculating from the single marker and the horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio a second corner opposite the first corner of the region.

21.   (original)   The display device of claim 16 wherein the means for ascertaining at least one marker includes means for ascertaining two markers defining opposite corners of the region.

22.   (original)   The display device of claim 16 further including, means for scaling the region to fit the horizontal and vertical resolution of the display.

23.   (original)   The display device of claim 16 wherein the means for buffering at least one row of the region includes means for buffering each row of the region.

24.   (previously presented)   A program storage system readable by a computer, tangibly embodying a program, applet, or instructions executable by the computer to perform method steps for fitting a frame of a video feed to a display device, the method comprising:

ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device;

buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed; and

displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.

25.   (original)   The program storage system of claim 24 wherein ascertaining at least one marker includes parsing out the at least one marker from the video feed.

26.   (original)   The program storage system of claim 25 wherein parsing out the at least one marker from the video feed includes parsing out the at least one marker from a header of the video feed.

27.   (original)   The program storage system of claim 24 wherein ascertaining at least one marker includes fixing the at least one marker for each video feed.

28.   (original)   The program storage system of claim 24 wherein ascertaining at least one marker includes ascertaining a single marker defining a first corner of the region and calculating from the single marker and the horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio a second corner opposite the first corner of the region.

29.   (original)   The program storage system of claim 24 wherein ascertaining at least one marker includes ascertaining two markers defining opposite corners of the region.

30.   (original)   The program storage system of claim 24 further including, scaling the region to fit the horizontal and vertical resolution of the display.

31.   (original)   The program storage system of claim 24 wherein buffering at least one row of the region includes buffering each row of the region.

IX. Evidence Appendix

None

X. Related Proceedings Appendix

None